UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/880,288	06/13/2001	Catherine Rose Morrow	60001.0036US01	5542

27488 7590 02/24/2004

MERCHANT & GOULD
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER	
ARSHAD, UMAR	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	3

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/880,288	Applicant(s) MORROW ET AL.	
	Examiner Umar Arshad	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 June 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 4 – 6, 12, 13, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gay et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,577,189.

As per claim 1, Gay et al. ("Gay") teaches a method of resizing a graphical user interface of a computer software application, the graphical user interface having at least one graphical user interface element disposed thereon, comprising the steps of:

altering the size of the graphical user interface dynamically to a selected size during running of the computer software application (see Gay, column 8, lines 33 – 36);

notifying a graphical user interface control module that the graphical user interface is being resized to the selected size (see Gay, column 8, lines 39 – 47);

notifying the graphical user interface element that it is to be repositioned on the graphical user interface according to a set of rules governing the position of graphical user interface elements on the graphical user interface (see Gay, column 8, lines 39 –

47; it is inherent that the graphical applications program is notified of the resize and repositioning of the graphical user interface element);

repositioning the graphical user interface element according to the set of rules (see Gay, column 8, lines 55 – 59; the examiner interprets a relationship between elements and the distribution frame as a set of rules); and

displaying the graphical user interface (see Gay, column 3, lines 58 – 61).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Gay teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Gay further teaches the method of Claim 1, whereby the step of repositioning the graphical user interface element according to the set of rules, includes

maintaining the graphical user interface element in the same relative position on the graphical user interface after the graphical user interface has been resized, as a position of the graphical user interface element prior to altering the size of the graphical user interface to the selected size (see Gay, figures 8A and 8B, items 96 and 97 and column 8, lines 29 – 32 and 36 – 40; it is inherent that items 97 remain in the same position after the distribution frame has been resized).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Gay teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Gay further teaches the method of Claim 1, whereby the step of displaying the graphical user interface, includes the steps of,

constructing a bitmap of the graphical user interface according the selected size;

positioning the graphical user interface element on the bitmap according to the set of rules; and

designating the bitmap for display (see Gay, column 3, lines 49 – 61; it is inherent that a bitmap reflecting the values stored of graphical elements is constructed before display).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Gay teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Gay further teaches the method of Claim 1, whereby the step of notifying, the graphical user interface element that it is to be repositioned, includes the steps of:

altering the graphical user interface element in response to altering the size of the graphical user interface (see Gay, column 8, lines 40 – 47).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Gay teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Gay further teaches the method of Claim 5, whereby the step of altering the graphical user interface element, includes the step of.

altering the size of the graphical user interface element (see gay, column 8, lines 40 – 47).

As per claim 12, it is of similar scope to claim 1 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 (see rejection above).

As per claim 13, it is of similar scope to claim 2 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 2 (see rejection above).

As per claim 15, it is of similar scope to claim 4 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 4 (see rejection above).

As per claim 16, it is of similar scope to claim 5 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 5 (see rejection above).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gay et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,577,189 in view of Argiolas, U.S. Patent No. 5,815,151.

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Gay teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Gay does not teach the method of Claim 1, whereby the step of repositioning the graphical user interface element according to the set of rules, includes placing the graphical user interface element in a different relative position on the graphical user interface after the graphical user interface has been resized, as a position of the graphical user interface element prior to altering the size of the graphical user interface to the selected size according to the set of rules as applied to the resized graphical user interface.

Argiolas teaches a method whereby the step of repositioning the graphical user interface element according to the set of rules, includes placing the graphical user interface element in a different relative position on the graphical user interface after the graphical user interface has been resized, as a position of the graphical user interface element prior to altering the size of the graphical user interface to the selected size according to the set of rules as applied to the resized graphical user interface (see Argiolas, figures 4a and 4b, and column 3, lines 52 – 58 and column 4, lines 9 – 15; it is inherent that when the window is resized the relative position of the graphical elements contained within are not moved, only focus is changed, therefore their relative positions to the window are different after resizing according to the rules as applied to the resized graphical user interface). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Argiolas with the method of Gay in order to allow a user to maintain a stable focus on graphical elements displayed within a window.

As per claim 14, it is of similar scope to claim 3 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 3 (see rejection above).

Claims 7 – 9, 11, 17, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gay et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,577,189 in view of Owings, U.S. Patent No. 6,335,743.

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Gay teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Gay does not teach the method of Claim 1, whereby the graphical user interface is a dialog window for providing access to functionality of the computer software application. Owings teaches a method of resizing a graphical user interface whereby the graphical user interface is a dialog window for providing access to functionality of the computer software application (see Owings, column 2, lines 16 – 18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Owings with the method of Gay in order to allow a developer to set how controls in a dialog window are to move upon resizing of the window.

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Gay teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Gay does not teach the method of Claim 1, whereby the

graphical user interface element includes a plurality of controls disposed on the graphical user interface. Owings teaches a method of resizing a graphical user interface whereby the graphical user interface element includes a plurality of controls disposed on the graphical user interface (see Owings, column 2, lines 16 – 18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Owings with the method of Gay in order to provide controls in the window which will be resized or moved when the window is resized.

As per claim 9, Gay teaches a method of resizing a frame of a computer software application, the frame having a plurality of elements disposed thereon, comprising the steps of:

running the computer software application;

altering the size of the frame dynamically by user action to a selected size while the computer software application is running (see Gay, column 8, lines 29 – 36);

notifying a manager module that the frame is being resized to the selected size (see column 8, lines 38 - 40; the examiner interprets a graphical applications program as a frame manager module);

notifying each of the plurality of elements that it is to be repositioned on the frame according to a set of rules governing the position of elements on the frame (see Gay, column 8, lines 55 – 58; it is inherent that the elements are notified if they are moved or resized);

repositioning the plurality of elements according to the set of rules (see Gay,

column 8, lines 55 – 58); and

displaying the frame (see Gay, column 3, lines 58 – 61).

Gay does not teach a method of resizing a dialog window of a computer software application, the dialog window having a plurality of controls disposed thereon. Owings teaches a method of resizing a dialog window of a computer software application, the dialog window having a plurality of controls disposed thereon (see Owings, column 2, lines 16 – 18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Owings with the method of Gay in order to provide controls in the window which will be resized or moved when the window is resized.

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 9, Gay and Owings teach the method of claim 9 (see rejection above). Gay further teaches the method of Claim 9, whereby the step of displaying the dialog window, includes the steps of,

constructing a bitmap of the dialog window according the selected size;

positioning the plurality of controls on the bitmap according to the set of rules; and

designating the bitmap for display (see Gay, column 3, lines 49 – 61; it is inherent that a bitmap reflecting the values stored of graphical elements is constructed before display).

As per claim 17, Gay teaches a system for resizing a frame of a computer

software application, the frame having a plurality of elements disposed thereon, comprising:

a computer operating system operative to run the computer software application (see Gay, column 3, lines 23 – 25);

a manager module operative to alter the size of the frame to a selected size in response to user action while the computer software application is running (see column 8, lines 38 - 40; the examiner interprets a graphical applications program as a manager module);

the computer operating system further operative to notify a manager module that the frame is being resized to the selected size (see Gay, column 3, lines 42 – 44; it is inherent that the operating system notifies the user interface of the graphical applications program of user actions, including resizing a frame);

the manager module further operative to notify each of the plurality of elements that it is to be repositioned on the dialog window according to a set of rules governing the position of elements on the frame (see Gay, column 8, lines 43 – 46);

an autolayout module operative to communicate to the manager module to reposition the plurality of elements according to the set of rules (see Gay, column 4, lines 13 – 15; the examiner interprets a constraint engine as an autolayout module); and

the operating system further operative to display the frame (see Gay, column 3, lines 58 – 61).

Gay does not teach a system for resizing a dialog window of a computer software application, the dialog window having a plurality of controls disposed thereon. Owings

teaches a system for resizing a dialog window of a computer software application, the dialog window having a plurality of controls disposed thereon (see Owings, column 2, lines 16 – 18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Owings with the method of Gay in order to provide controls in the window which will be resized or moved when the window is resized.

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 17, Gay and Owings teach the method of claim 17 (see rejection above). Gay further teaches the system of Claim 17, whereby the autolayout module is further operative to maintain the plurality of controls in the same relative position on the dialog window after the dialog window has been resized, as a position of the plurality of controls prior to altering the size of the dialog window to the selected size (see Gay, figures 8A and 8B, items 96 and 97 and column 8, lines 29 – 32 and 36 – 40; it is inherent that items 97 remain in the same position after the distribution frame has been resized).

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 17, Gay and Owings teach the method of claim 17 (see rejection above). Gay further teaches the system of Claim 17, whereby the dialog manager module is further operative;

to construct a bitmap of the dialog window according the selected size; to position the plurality of controls on the bitmap according a repositioning of the plurality of controls performed by the autolayout module; and

to designate the bitmap for display by the operating system (see Gay, column 3, lines 49 – 61; it is inherent that a bitmap reflecting the values stored of graphical elements is constructed before display).

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gay et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,577,189 in view of Owings, U.S. Patent No. 6,335,743 as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Thomson, U.S. Patent No. 5,682,487.

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 9, Gay and Owings teach the method of Claim 9 (see rejection above). Gay does not teach the method of Claim 9, whereby the step of repositioning the plurality of controls according to the set of rules, includes specifying a plurality of frames, each frame representing a region within the dialog window, the frames forming a hierarchical tree of frames, the tree of frames including at least one parent frame having at least one associated child frame, wherein a region represented by each parent frame encloses a region represented by its associated child frame, each of the plurality of controls having an associated frame; determining a minimum size of each child frame; determining a minimum size of each parent frame based on the minimum sizes of its child frames; determining a position for each parent frame; determining a position of each child frame based on the position of its parent frame; determining a size and position of each of the plurality of controls, based on the determined size and position of its their associated frames; and

designating for display with the dialog window each of the plurality of controls according to their size and position.

Thomson teaches a method of resizing a dialog box whereby a step of repositioning the plurality of controls according to the set of rules includes

specifying a plurality of frames, each frame representing a region within the dialog window, the frames forming a hierarchical tree of frames, the tree of frames including at least one parent frame having at least one associated child frame, wherein a region represented by each parent frame encloses a region represented by its associated child frame, each of the plurality of controls having an associated frame (see Thomson, column 4, lines 57 – 65; the examiner interprets a widget as a frame and it is inherent that each control of the dialog box is associated to a widget);

determining a minimum size of each child frame (see Thomson, column 6, lines 6 – 11; it is inherent that the size of the view determines the size of the image to be displayed in a widget, and therefore the minimum size of the widget);

determining a minimum size of each parent frame based on the minimum sizes of its child frames (see Thomson, column 6, lines 14 – 20; it is inherent that when the size of the view is 33% then the minimum size of the top most widget will be determined by the minimum sizes of the child widgets to be displayed at 33%);

determining a position for each parent frame;

determining a position of each child frame based on the position of its parent frame (see Thomson, figure 7, items 710 – 740 and column 5, lines 14 – 21; it is inherent that the position of the child frames depends on the position of the parent

frame because different dialog windows representing different devices are displayed at different locations in figure 7, and all corresponding frames are displayed inside their corresponding parent frames);

determining a size and position of each of the plurality of controls, based on the determined size and position of its their associated frames (see Thomson, column 5, lines 10 – 13 and column 6, lines 6 - 11; it is inherent that the controls are displayed as widgets with a certain size of a photo-realistic images); and

designating for display with the dialog window each of the plurality of controls according to their size and position (see Thomson, figure 7, items 710 – 740, and column 5, lines 14 – 21).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Thomson with the method of Gay and Owings in order to provide a consistent view of a resized dialog window.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gay et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,577,189 in view of Owings, U.S. Patent No. 6,335,743 as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Argiolas, U.S. Patent No. 5,815,151.

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 17, Gay and Owings teach the method of claim 17 (see rejection above). Gay does not teach the system of Claim 17, whereby the autolayout module is further operative to maintain the plurality of controls in

a different relative position on the dialog window and each of the plurality of controls in a different relative position to each other on the dialog window after the dialog window has been resized, as a position of the plurality of controls prior to altering the size of the dialog window to the selected size according to the set of rules as applied to the resized graphical user interface.

Argiolas teaches maintaining the plurality of graphical elements in a different relative position on the dialog window and each of the plurality of controls in a different relative position to each other on the dialog window after the dialog window has been resized, as a position of the plurality of controls prior to altering the size of the dialog window to the selected size according to the set of rules as applied to the resized graphical user interface (see Argiolas, figures 4a and 4b, and column 3, lines 52 – 58 and column 4, lines 9 – 15; it is inherent that when the window is resized the relative position of the graphical elements contained within are not moved, only focus is changed, therefore their relative positions to the window are different after resizing according to the rules as applied to the resized graphical user interface). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Argiolas with the method of Gay in order to allow a user to maintain a stable focus on graphical elements displayed within a window.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Umar Arshad whose telephone number is (703) 305-0329. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

UA

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100